

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-14, 17-32, 34-44, 46-47, 55-69, and 72-73 are pending.

Claims 1, 3-6, 12, 18, 20, 21, 32, 34, 35, 42, 46, 55, 56, 57-59, 60, 63, and 66 have been amended.

Claims 2, 15, 16, 33, 45, 48-54, and 70-71 have been canceled.

A clean copy of the pending claims is attached to this response for the examiner's convenience.

Drawings:

The examiner objects to the drawings' failure to show lip 258, as referenced at page 8, line 1 of Applicant's disclosure, and requests corrected drawings. Applicant however feels it would be simpler to address this issue by amending the paragraph ([0022]) in the specification to delete this element numeral, and has so done in this response. The Applicant assumes this alternative will be acceptable to the examiner. A clean copy of the amended paragraph is attached to this response.

Art-Based Rejections

In responding to the Examiner's prior art rejections, Applicant only justifies the patentability of his independent claims (i.e., claims 1, 18, 32, and 55). As the Examiner will appreciate, should these independent claims be patentable over the prior art, narrower dependent claims would also be patentable. Accordingly, Applicant does not separately discuss the

patentability of his dependent claims, although it reserves the right to do so at a later time if necessary.

Independent claims 1, 18, 32 and 55 stand rejected as (1) anticipated by USP 5,329,752 ("Milbourn"), and (2) as obvious given the combination of USP 5,501,257 ("Hickman") and USP 6,643,933 ("Seigneur"¹).


Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 18, 32, and 55 to obviate these bases for rejection. Thus, these claims now recite that the spraying feature of Applicant's claimed invention occurs through the use of a "plurality of nozzles" which direct the chemical treatment "generally parallel with the plane of the at least one saw blade." Support for this additional limitation can be found in paragraph 0025 of Applicant's disclosure, and therefore does not constitute new matter.

This feature is not disclosed or suggested by either Milbourn or Seigneur—the two references which disclosed administering fluids to vegetation. For example, in Milbourn, nozzles 82 (see Fig. 10) direct the chemical treatment perpendicular to the plane of the saw blade 42 (see Fig. 6). In Seigneur, the nozzles ("dispersal holes") 24 (see Fig. 2) again direct the chemical treatment perpendicular to the plane of the saw blade (i.e., the chain around guide bar 22). Moreover, it is clear that neither of these references suggest to one of ordinary skill in the art the possibility of providing nozzles parallel to the plane of the saw blade.

¹ The Examiner called this reference "David."

Applicant submits that pending claims 1, 3-14, 17-32, 34-44, 46-47, 55-69, and 72-73 are now allowable, and requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowance. Please feel free to contact the undersigned with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,


Terrell Lewis, Reg. No. 46,065**CUSTOMER NO. 29855**

Wong, Cabello, Lutsch,
Rutherford & Brucculeri, L.L.P.
20333 SH 249
Suite 600
Houston, TX 77070
Phone: 832-446-2422
Fax: 832-446-2424